

My name is Zachary Carrell. I've lived in the town of Vernon for about a year, and before that I was a resident of the city of Hartford. I urge you to:

**Oppose S.B. 16** – This bill does very little to address juvenile crime and it shouldn't be here in a bill with a large amount of problems. This bill would ensure that gun groups cannot openly carry at protests for bills like this, bringing up potential free speech and 1<sup>st</sup> amendment concerns. Carrying guns on public transit is already banned in every district I know of. I'm concerned that the requirement to show your permit if carrying openly, even if you're not suspected of a crime, will be used to detain minority residents of Connecticut cities like Hartford at a larger rate than many of those from rural Connecticut that might carry openly.

The bill, in its current state, would also make owning a 22LR black rifle a felony. They are incredibly popular among gun owners here. They would become felons overnight. 22LR is very small, great for shooting at the range or hunting small rodents. People shoot them largely for fun and aren't self-defense rounds. They aren't ammo used in so-called assault weapons by any stretch, and I think Connecticut would have an uphill battle defending the public safety benefits of this in court.

**Oppose H.B. 5416** – This bill would make collecting antique firearms difficult for Connecticut citizens due to the one gun per month. Public safety justifications for this bill are completely unfounded, and other courts have pointed this out; something similar was passed in Washington, D.C. and was struck down 7 years ago by their district court. I can provide a full copy of this decision if needed, but here is their justification for overturning their law:

The District has not presented substantial evidence to support the conclusion that its prohibition on the registration of "more than one pistol per registrant during any 30-day period," D.C. Code § 7-2502.03(e), "promotes a substantial governmental interest that would be achieved less effectively absent the regulation." *Heller II*, 670 F.3d at 1258 (quoting *Rock Against Racism*, 491 U.S. at 782-83). It is therefore unconstitutional.

**Support S.B. 388** – I was a victim of a home invasion this past year. I was physically assaulted at my front door as the man stood in the entryway, and I had reason to believe he was armed. Thankfully, I didn't have to fire my Beretta, but home invasions don't always end this way. Think about if the invader took the life of someone in the home, a wife, husband or child, or attempted to, and the court has the audacity afterwards to suggest that those in the home could have fled or shot the invader in a less fatal area had it come to that. It's insulting. It's reasonable to believe deadly force is necessary in these circumstances, and this bill would create that presumption in law.

**Support H.B. 5412** – I feel I've already made my point in S.B. 388 that a person shouldn't be required to retreat or flee in cases where deadly force is being used. It's incredibly unfortunate that people bent on destruction choose to invade a church during service, but under current Connecticut law, people are not made safer. Churches without police protection should be able to take a stand should they choose.

**Support H.B. 5415** – I don't understand why this wasn't implemented from the start. We already limit the number of AR-15s, etc. in our state. Why not allow to transfer them to family members who've already been vetted to possess other weapons?